

**MINUTES OF  
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2016**

PRESENT: Peter F. Murphy, Springfield District  
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District  
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large  
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commission At-Large  
Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District  
John C. Ulfelder, Dranesville District  
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District  
Julie M. Strandlie, Mason District  
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District  
Karen Keys-Gamarra, Jr., Sully District

ABSENT: Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District  
Janyce N. Hedetniemi, Commissioner At-Large

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:15 p.m., by Chairman Peter F. Murphy, in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

**COMMISSION MATTERS**

Commissioner Flanagan indicated that staff had requested that the public hearing for PA 2016-IV-MV1, Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the North Hill Site, be deferred; therefore, he MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR PA 2016-IV-MV1, COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT, NORTH HILL SITE, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF OCTOBER 27, 2016.

Commissioner Sargeant seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Hedetniemi and Lawrence were absent from the meeting.

//

**FS-H16-36 – VERIZON WIRELESS, 11800 Sunset Hills Road, Reston**

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

Commissioner de la Fe: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a “feature shown.” It is FS-H16-36 of Verizon Wireless and this is to put telecommunications facility on a building at 11800 Sunset Hills Road in Reston, Virginia, and I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND ZONING’S DETERMINATION THAT THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY PROPOSED BY VERIZON WIRELESS LOCATED AT 11800 SUNSET HILLS ROAD, RESTON, VIRGINIA, 20190, IS SUBSTANTIALLY IN

ACCORD WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND SHOULD BE CONSIDERED A “FEATURE SHOWN,” PURSUANT OF *VIRGINIA CODE* SECTION 15.2-2232, AS AMENDED.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of the motion – excuse me – to concur with the “feature shown” determination in FS-H16-36, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you very much.

(The motion carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioner Strandlie was not present for the vote. Commissioners Hedetniemi and Lawrence were absent from the meeting.)

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

#### ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Chairman Murphy established the following order of the agenda:

1. PA 2015-I-J1 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (GRAHAM PARK/LOEHMANN'S PLAZA)

This order was accepted without objection.

//

PA 2015-I-J1 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT (GRAHAM PARK/LOEHMANN'S PLAZA) – To consider proposed revisions to the Comprehensive Plan for Fairfax County, VA, in accordance with the Code of Virginia, Title 15.2, Chapter 22. This Amendment concerns approx. 19.51 ac. generally located on the southwest corner of Arlington Boulevard (Route 50) and Graham Road [Tax Map parcels 50-3 ((1)) 5, 5A, 5E, and 5G]. The area is planned for community-serving retail uses up to 0.35 floor area ratio (FAR). The amendment considers a mixture of residential and nonresidential uses at an intensity up to 0.50 FAR. Recommendations relating to the transportation network may also be modified. PA 2015-I-J1 is concurrently under review with Rezoning and Final Development Plan application RZ/FDP 2016-MA-022. MASON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Bernard Suchicital, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended adoption of PA 2015-I-J1.

Commissioner Strandlie acknowledged the concerns raised by residents of the surrounding community regarding existing traffic conditions in and around the subject property. She then requested additional information on the mechanisms for addressing this issue through the provisions prescribed by the Comprehensive Plan and the rezoning process. Mr. Suchicital explained the following:

- The existing recommendations of Comprehensive Plan included provisions to preserve the suburban character of the surrounding community;
- The Comprehensive Plan included recommendations for transportation improvements around the subject property, but these improvements applied primarily to Route 50 and other major arterial roadways; and
- The rezoning process would provide opportunities for additional provisions to address the transportation issues associated with the subject property and the surrounding residential communities.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Strandlie and Mr. Suchicital regarding the scope of the proposed Amendment, the extent to which transportation issues were addressed in this Amendment, and the extent to which such issues could be addressed without the proposed Amendment. Mr. Suchicital indicated that the majority of the transportation issues associated with the site would be addressed during the rezoning process, adding that approval of the proposed Amendment would provide additional opportunities to address these issues.

Commissioner Hart pointed out that the existing provisions for traffic circulation and ingress/egress on the site were not adequate. Referring to the last bullet point on page 10 of the staff report, which included a revision to the Plan text that would require that traffic circulation within the site be improved, he expressed concern that this language did not articulate specific guidelines for improving this condition. In addition, Commissioner Hart asked whether staff had evaluated specific provisions for the existing access points and service drive as a means of addressing these circulation issues. Mr. Suchicital pointed out that the proposed Amendment included language that recommended further evaluation of provisions that would provide an alternative access point to the site and such provisions could include modifications to the existing service drive. Angela Martinez, Transportation Planner, Fairfax County Department of Transportation (FCDOT), concurred with Mr. Suchicital's remarks regarding the existing transportation and traffic circulation issues on the site, but explained that specific provisions for addressing these issues had not been finalized and the language of the proposed Amendment would ensure that such issues would be evaluated during the rezoning process. She added that such provisions could include modifications to the service drive, installing additional access points to the site, and restriping the roads in and around the site.

In response to questions from Commissioner Hurley, Mr. Suchicital said that the subject property was exempt from the revised proffer legislation implemented by the Virginia General Assembly because the rezoning application for this site had been filed prior to July 1, 2016. However, he indicated that the surrounding area was not exempt from this legislation.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker and recited the rules for public testimony.

Sandy McConville, 7424 Brad Street, Falls Church, representing Raymondale Civic Association (RCA), stated that the RCA had met on October 12, 2016, to discuss the proposed Amendment. She then said that, as a result of such discussions, the RCA's position was as follows:

- The RCA supported the existing commercial development on the subject property and did not object to further revitalization efforts;
- The RCA favored a redevelopment that would accommodate community-serving businesses, include pedestrian-friendly provisions, and install additional green space on the site;
- The RCA acknowledged the existing concerns regarding the traffic congestion around the area and the ingress/egress provisions on the site;
- The existing traffic conditions at the site generated significant stacking at the intersection of Graham Road and Route 50 because of the limited access points to the site;
- The RCA expressed concern that the overall traffic impact of the transportation provisions that would be included with a redevelopment of the site had not been sufficiently evaluated;
- The RCA requested additional information regarding the type of tenants and businesses that would be included in a redevelopment of the site;
- The RCA requested additional information regarding the green space provisions that would be incorporated into a redevelopment of the site;
- The RCA supported additional study of the light and noise impact that a redevelopment of the site would incur on the surrounding residential communities;
- The RCA requested clarification on the extent to which the Virginia General Assembly's proffer legislation passed during its 2016 session affected the subject property; and
- The RCA concurred with concerns of other neighboring residential communities regarding the impact the proposed redevelopment of the site would incur on the local school system.

(A copy of Ms. McConville's statement is in the date file.)

Commissioner Strandlie stated that she had visited the subject property and concurred with the RCA's concerns regarding the existing traffic issues on the site, noting the frequent congestion that occurred on the service drive. She then noted that the applicant that had submitted a rezoning application for the site prior to this public hearing was aware of this issue and would address it during the review process for this application. Commissioner Strandlie added that by being exempt from the proffer legislation, the applicant would be able to include the necessary provisions to address the outstanding traffic issue. In addition, Commissioner Strandlie encouraged the RCA to participate in the review process of the rezoning applications for the site, noting that the Mason District Land Use Committee would conduct public meetings to review the application.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Flanagan and Ms. McConville regarding the location of her residence, the size of the Raymondale community, the proximity of this community to the subject property, and the location of other communities that utilized the existing commercial development on the site.

When Commissioner Migliaccio asked whether there was an access point to the existing commercial development on the site along the southern border, Ms. McConville indicated there was no such access, adding that the primary point of access to the site from the south was on Graham Road. In addition, she expressed concern that installing an additional point of access on this area would generate cut-through traffic within the existing residential neighborhoods.

A discussion between Commissioner Flanagan and Ms. McConville ensued regarding whether the RCA had submitted revisions to the language of the proposed Amendment and the additional opportunities for providing such revisions. Ms. McConville indicated that while the RCA had not submitted revisions for the proposed Amendment, such revisions would be submitted prior to the Board of Supervisors' public hearing for this Amendment.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Strandlie and Ms. McConville regarding the most effective methods for submitting proposed revisions to the proposed Amendment, the RCA's primary concerns for the subject property, and the scope of the proposed Amendment wherein Ms. McConville reiterated that the RCA had not submitted such revisions, adding that transportation issues was the community's primary concern and the RCA had been informed that such issues would be addressed during the rezoning process.

David Gill, 1750 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 1800, Tysons, representing McGuireWoods LLP, said that he was speaking on behalf of the existing owner of the subject property. He stated that changes in economic trends had made a redevelopment of this site necessary. He also pointed out the location of the subject property and noted the unique features of the existing commercial development compared to similar developments in the area. He then described the character of the existing development on the site, adding that the site was not located within a revitalization area or a transit station area. Mr. Gill said that the property owner intended to redevelop the site in a manner that was consistent with the density of the surrounding residential development and preserve the existing character of the surrounding communities. He also stated that he supported the language in the proposed Amendment. In addition, he indicated that the subject property was

not located in a special tax district. Mr. Gill acknowledged the community's concerns regarding the existing traffic conditions around the site, stating that the property owner would address these issues during the rezoning process and provisions such as modifying the access points on the site would be evaluated. He also echoed remarks from Mr. Suchicital that the redevelopment of the site would not be subject to the Virginia General Assembly's proffer legislation that had been implemented on July 1, 2016.

Alison Williams, representing Federal Realty Investment Trust (FRIT), 1626 East Jefferson Street, Rockville, stated that FRIT was the current property owner of the site. She said that she concurred with Mr. Gill's remarks regarding the character and unique features of the site. She also echoed Mr. Gill's remarks regarding the changing trends in retail development throughout the County, noting an increasing preference to developments with more urban features. Ms. Williams indicated that a redevelopment would preserve the existing elements of a community-serving shopping center on the site, noting the variety of commercial establishments currently present at the site. In addition, she indicated that redevelopment of similar sites had occurred in other areas, citing a property in Rockville, Maryland as an example. She then described the features of such redevelopments, noting the similarities between these properties and the subject property. Ms. Williams stated that a rezoning application to redevelop the site had been submitted and was under review. She then acknowledged the concerns from staff and the community regarding the existing traffic congestion around the site and indicated that this issue would be addressed during the rezoning process. She also described potential provisions for alleviating issues pertaining to traffic congestion and internal circulation on the site, highlighting one such provision that would install a street that would run down the center of the property and connect with Route 50.

Commissioner Flanagan concurred with remarks from Ms. Williams and Mr. Gill regarding the unique conditions associated with the site. He also pointed out that Route 50, which ran along the northern border of the site, had a median that included a fence that prohibited pedestrians from crossing this road. He then asked whether installing a street that would run down the center of the property, as described by Ms. Williams, would include mechanisms for controlling pedestrian traffic accessing the site from north of Route 50. Ms. Williams explained that such a street would connect to an existing traffic light that permitted pedestrians to cross Route 50 from the north, but noted that such a provision had not been finalized and additional provisions could be incorporated during the rezoning process. In addition, she said that such a street would also provide an additional access point for vehicles to alleviate the internal circulation issues on the site. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Flanagan and Ms. Williams regarding the existing access points utilized by vehicles to enter or exit the site, the existing pedestrian paths that served the site, and the possibility of implementing additional provisions to improve accessibility to the site during redevelopment.

Referring to Table 1 of Page 6 of the staff report, Commissioner Ulfelder asked whether a redevelopment of the site that would install a street running down the center of the property utilized Option 1B, which included a mixed-use development that was half-residential and half-retail. Ms. Williams concurred that such a provision was consistent with Option 1B. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Williams regarding the overall mix of retail and residential for a redevelopment of the site, the estimated number of trips that a redevelopment

utilizing Option 1B would generate, the ongoing traffic analysis being conducted on the site, and the schedule for the pending rezoning application for the site wherein Ms. Williams said that the public hearing date for the rezoning application had not been determined.

Commissioner Sargeant pointed out that communities in the Mason District frequently raised concerns regarding the preservation of existing residential neighborhoods, adding that the preservation of such neighborhoods was articulated in the Comprehensive Plan. He then asked for additional information regarding possible provisions to discourage cut-through traffic within the surrounding residential neighborhoods. Ms. Williams reiterated that there were limited access points to the site, noting that it could only be accessed from Route 50 and Graham Road. She then explained that the property owner would coordinate with FCDOT to address issues pertaining to these access points, as well as issues pertaining to the service road and pedestrian access. She added that provisions for addressing such issues would be finalized during the rezoning process. In addition, Ms. Williams described the procedures for securing appropriate tenants for the redevelopment and the possible designs for the open space that would be installed for such a redevelopment, citing the open space designs at other properties that could be utilized. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Sargeant and Ms. Williams regarding the extent and design of the open space that would be incorporated into a redevelopment of the site and Commissioner Sargeant expressed support for the installation of such open space, noting the importance of utilizing such space to create a sense of place.

When Commissioner Sargeant asked whether a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan would be included in the rezoning application for the site, Ms. Williams indicated that such a plan would be included. He then suggested that this TDM Plan complement the transportation provisions of surrounding properties to alleviate traffic throughout the area.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience.

Suzanne Hughes, 3221 Graham Road, Falls Church, representing Broyhill Park Civic Association, said she resided in close proximity to the site, noting that her street was utilized to access the existing site. She described the Broyhill Park community, noting the existing traffic volume throughout the area and the limited points to Route 50 from this community. Ms. Hughes also indicated that these high traffic volumes and limited access points created significant congestion for vehicles accessing the subject property or Route 50. She then stated that she did not support the proposed Amendment because the inclusion of a residential component on the subject property would further increase the traffic throughout the area and the existing provisions for addressing this issue were insufficient. Ms. Hughes also indicated that such a redevelopment would increase the amount of cut-through traffic in surrounding neighborhoods, increase vehicular stacking for vehicles accessing Route 50 or Annandale Road, increase the amount of non-residential parking in the surrounding neighborhoods, and contribute to overcrowding throughout the local school system. In addition, she expressed concern that the recommended height of the buildings for a redevelopment on the site was excessive and the existing park facilities in the area were not sufficient to accommodate a residential component on the site.

Thomas M. Leary, 3019 Fenwick Road, Falls Church, aligned himself with remarks from Ms. McConville regarding the existing traffic issues around the site. He also expressed support for

implementing provisions to facilitate pedestrian traffic entering and exiting the site from the north. In addition, Mr. Leary pointed out the location of a library and an active fire station near the subject property. He then encouraged that prospective applicants coordinate with these facilities in pursuing a redevelopment of the site. Mr. Leary indicated that he supported redeveloping the existing commercial development on the site, but noted the importance of ensuring that such a redevelopment addressed the existing traffic issues in the surrounding area.

John Curle, 3168 Nealon Drive, Falls Church, stated that he supported the redevelopment of the existing commercial development on the subject property. However, he requested that additional information be provided regarding the following issues:

- The provisions that would be implemented to alleviate the existing traffic conditions in the surrounding area;
- The provisions that a redevelopment of the site would accommodate public transportation and the bicycle plan for the surrounding area; and
- The commitments that would be made to address the environmental impact of a redevelopment of the site, particularly the impacts pertaining to the streams in the area;

In addition, Mr. Curle aligned himself with remarks from Ms. Hughes regarding the impact that the building height and density of a redevelopment on the site would incur on the surrounding community.

Chairman Murphy informed Mr. Curle that the details for the provisions that would address his concerns would be finalized during the rezoning process and addressing such issues was beyond the scope of the proposed Amendment. He also said that such a rezoning application would be subject to the approval of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, adding that an application would be reviewed by the Mason District Land Use Committee.

There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called for closing remarks from Mr. Suchicital, who declined.

Commissioner Strandlie pointed out that Page 9 of the Staff Report included standard language regarding in-kind contributions for local schools that had been submitted by Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPS). She then indicated that such language was not included in the proposed Plan text articulated in the proposed Amendment, adding that there would be additional coordination between staff and FCPS regarding such language.

Commissioner Strandlie pointed out that the pending rezoning application for the subject application had not been reviewed by the Mason District Land Use Council and the schedule for reviewing this application had not been determined. She added that there would be additional opportunities for coordination between the community, staff, and the prospective applicant to address the concerns associated with this redevelopment.



There were no further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Strandlie for action on this item.

*(Start Verbatim Transcript)*

//

Chairman Murphy: Are there any other questions? If not, public hearing is closed. Recognize Ms. Strandlie.

Commissioner Strandlie: Okay, thank you. Mr. Chairman, I – again, thank you to everyone for coming out tonight. The Land Use Committee has approved – unanimously recommended this – and it's been through several reiterations in informational meetings and decision meetings for the Land Use Committee. And we appreciate the – the dialog that the developers have engaged with the community and we hope and expect that that will continue through the rezoning process. There are many challenges to this site. It's well worth working out. It's a great opportunity for the community and we look forward to continuing that dialog. With that, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR PA 2015-I-J1, AS SHOWN ON PAGES 9 THROUGH 11 OF THE STAFF REPORT DATED OCTOBER 6, 2016. THE RECOMMENDATION would recommend the Plan – WOULD AMEND THE PLAN TO ADD AN OPTION FOR RESIDENTIAL MIXED-USE UP TO AN OVERALL 0.50 FAR, WITH CONDITIONS ON TAX MAP PARCELS 50-3 ((1)) 5, 5A, 5E, AND 5G. THIS REDEVELOPMENT OPTION WOULD SUPPORT THE REVITALIZATION AND REINVESTMENT IN GRAHAM PARK PLAZA AND IMPROVE VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION. Thank you.

Commissioner Flanagan: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Flanagan. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it adopt Plan Amendment 2015-I-J1, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

(The motion carried by a vote of 10-0. Commissioners Hedetniemi and Lawrence were absent from the meeting.)

*(End Verbatim Transcript)*

//

The meeting was adjourned at 9:09 p.m.


Peter F. Murphy, Chairman

James R. Hart, Secretary

Audio and video recordings of this meeting are available at the Planning Commission Office,  
12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 330, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Minutes by: Jacob Caporaletti

Approved on: March 29, 2017



---

John W. Cooper, Clerk to the  
Fairfax County Planning Commission